REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT
PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: **India High Range Landscape Project** - Developing an effective multiple-use management framework for conserving biodiversity in the mountain landscape of the High Ranges, the Western Ghats, India.			
Country (ies):	India	GEF Project ID:	4743
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4651
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment & Forests (MoEF), Government of India	Submission Date:	October 31, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➢ For SFM/REDD+ ☐ ➢ For SGP ☐		Agency Fee ($):	627,500

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK[1]

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Financing from GEF	Indicative Co Financing ($)
BD 1: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	Output 1. New protected areas (covering 11,600 ha) that cover unprotected ecosystems and improve management effectiveness of 37,100 ha of existing PAs	GEFTF	1,870,000	6,000,000
BD 2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.	Output 1. Policies and regulatory frameworks for production sectors (forestry, tea, cardamom, tourism)	GEFTF	3,642,100	20,000,000
	Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.	Output 2. National and sub-national land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation for mountains landscape covering over 200,000 ha	GEFTF	467,900	2,000,000
Project management cost			GEFTF	295,000	2,000,000
Total project costs				6,275,000	30,000,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To protect biodiversity of the High Range Mountain Landscape (HRML) of the southern Western Ghats in peninsular India from existing and emergent threats through building an effective collaborative governance framework for multiple use management.					
Project Component	**Grant Type**	**Expected Outcomes**	**Expected Outputs**	**GEF Financing ($)**	**Co-Financing($)**

---

[1] Refer to the Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework when completing Table A.

Effective governance framework for multiple-use mountain landscape management in place	TA	• An effective governance framework for planning, managing and compliance monitoring in the multiple use mountain landscape in place. No net loss of forest cover in major habitat blocks totalling 164,700 ha in the High Range Mountain Landscape (HRML) covering 310,000 ha and reducing pressures on wildlife populations with ranges shared with PAs of > 400,000 ha adjacent to the Landscape. • Improved institutional capacities to effectively plan, implement, monitor and mainstream biodiveristy considerations into production activities at landscape level as measured by at least 30 percent increase in Capacity Scorecard. • Knowledge generation and implementation of decision support systems with well informed replication strategies for incorporating biodiversity and ecosystem values into land use planning and management in at least 3,000,000 ha of mountain landscapes across the Himalayas, Western and Eastern Ghats, and Central Indian Highlands.	• Landscape Level Land-Use Plan (LLLUP) and regulations in place that allocates lands to optimal land uses based on biodiversity considerations by a) improving the management of existing Protected Areas (PAs); b) identifying areas of high biodiversity to be accorded higher protection status; c) prescribing appropriate land uses and management practices in the adjacent production landscape; d) strengthening land use regulations, thus avoiding, reducing and mitigating impacts from physical development in major production sectors • Dedicated cross sectoral landscape coordination platform ensuring sectoral compliance with the LLLUP prescriptions. • Improved decision support system for managing multiple use mountain landscapes through: a) values of forests (e.g. *valuation of ecosystem goods and services from HRML)* and externalities of deforestation and forest degradation incorporated into sector decisions and finance secured to offset opportunity costs; b) GIS mapping tools inform physical development and placement of infrastructure across the landscape.	750,100	2,000,000
Applying Multiple Use Mountain Landscape (MUML) management	INV	• Improved PA management effectiveness (measured by METT) delivers enhanced protection to 371,00 ha of 8 existing mountain PAs and leads to increase in PA coverage by another 11,650 ha in the High Ranges. • Population status of globally threatened species such as Nilgiri tahr, Grizzled giant squirrel and Elephants remains stable or increases • At least 84,600 ha of High Value Biodiversity Areas (HVBAs) accorded elevated protection status ensuring conservation of biodiversity rich areas and leading to improved ecological connectivity between PAs that enhances PA resilience to climate change. • Direct reduction in pressure from production sectors (tea, cardamom, tourism) as evidenced by a) no net loss of natural forest blocks in critical corridors on estates; b) reduction in usage of chemical pesticides in tea and cardamom sectors; c) number of energy efficient processing/ curing units adopted by tea and cardamom sectors.	• PA management functions strengthened. This includes: monitoring and enforcement, and visitor management; • Notification of additional areas of significant biological diversity as part of PA system; • Key corridors between PAs secured through a) identifying and mapping key HVBAs and forest fragments in the project landscape; b) elevating the legal status of identified critical biodiversity areas outside PAs ; c) rehabilitation/ eco-restoration of critically degraded areas (with co- finance). • Financial resources secured to meet long term PA management objectives for the expanded PAs and HVBAs. • Integration of biodiversity considerations into the operations of key economic sectors through: a) incentivizing sustainable resource use through product branding/ certification for environmentally sustainable production operations (tea, cardamom) and other market mechanisms (e.g. premium sale of organic products); • Implementation support to critical activities identified in the LLLUP (e.g. regeneration of forest fragments, planting of native species as canopy trees in cardamom plantations, promotion of solar technology for energy use in tea and cardamom plantations, improving productivity of energy woodlots of tea industry, delineating 'no take-zones' in forest fragments in tea/ cardamom areas).	3,500,600	15,000,000
Community-based sustainable use and management of wild resource	TA	Sustainable use management system for wild resources by local communities improves biodiversity conservation status of mountain forest areas as indicated by: a) reduction in biodiversity pressures (illicit felling, over-grazing, poaching); b) reduced reports in the media and other sources about human-	• Community based organizations (local self-governments, JFMCs, Self Help Groups (SHGs)) for co-managing wild resource harvests with the Forest Department. Clear rules, roles and responsibilities agreed between the Forest Department and local communities. Sustainable use management system in place that prescribes: i) resource	1,729,300	11,000,000

wildlife conflicts (reduced crop and livestock depredation); c) key harvested species populations (e.g. medicinal plants, black dammar.) remain stable through-out project period; d) 15 percent increase in the income of local communities attributed to BD friendly enterprises	off-take limits; ii) zones where harvesting can take place; iii) mechanisms for monitoring and enforcement including community sanctions against defaulters; iv) internal democratic and equitable benefit sharing mechanism. • Safeguards for financial, technical and business management support to avoid promoting practices with negative impacts on biodiversity. • Specific community-based natural resource management governance model for unique tribal local self-government (*Edamalakkudi panchayat)*. This will serve as a learning centre for potential replication across the country in the context of Forest Rights Act, 2006.		
Sub-total		5,980,000	28,000,000
Project management cost		295,000	2,000,000
Total project costs		**6,275,000**	**30,000,000**

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME ($)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type	Amount ($)
Project Government Contribution	MoEF and Kerala Sate Government[2]	Grant (partner managed)	28,000,000
Private Sector	Cardamon Growers Association	Grant (partner managed)	1,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	1,000,000
Total Co-financing			**30,000,000**

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY[1]

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name	Grant Amount	Agency Fee	Total
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	India	6,275,000	627,500	6,902,500
Total Grant Resources				**6,275,000**	**627,500**	**6,902,500**

[1] In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.
[2] Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount ($)	Cofinancing ($)	Project Total ($)
International Consultants	35,000	0	35,000
National/Local Consultants	668,100	350,000	1,018,100

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT?   No

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF[3]

A.1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc:

N/A

---

[2] The in-kind co-financing from the private sector is subsumed under the government co-financing letter.
[3] For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.
N/A

A.3. The GEF Agency's comparative advantage.
In addition, UNDP has finalized its Biodiversity and Ecosystem Framework for 2012 and 2020, which will be integrated in the UNDP Business plan and country programmes. Under the Framework, the first Signature Programme is dedicated to "integrating biodiversity and ecosystem management into development planning and production sector activities to safeguard biodiversity and maintain ecosystem services that sustain human wellbeing" to which this project adequately aligns with by reducing land degradation and supporting sustainable land management.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address.

The attached Project Document (Part 1) provides substantially more detailed baseline analysis than covered in the PIF; but there are no significant changes in the overall project approach and design.

High Range Mountain Landscape (HRML), nestled in the Western Ghats mountains of peninsular India is globally significant due to the following reasons: a) high levels of endemism and repository of presumably several new species; b) richest biome in the Western Ghats; c) presence of globally threatened species of fauna, flora and ecosystems; d) part of the World Heritage Site under UNESCO; e) an Important Bird Area (IBA); f) catchment of three major river systems in the southern Western Ghats; g) one of the five viable breeding centres of tiger in the entire country and part of the largest habitat for elephants in the southern Western Ghats; h) harbors the largest global population of the highly threatened Nilgiri tahr and a significant population of Grizzled Giant Squirrel; i) strong eco-cultural affinities and presence of ethnic groups that depend heavily on natural resources for livelihoods; j) supports important economic sectors like cardamom, tea and tourism; k) vegetal cover in the region acts as a shield against the impacts of climate change; l) high potential for carbon sequestration; m) there has been no major project in this region for mainstreaming biodiversity. Further, HRML is a peep into the future in terms of the trajectory of development taking place in other mountain areas in the country where there is an intricate interplay of ecological and anthropogenic factors.

At present, HRML remains a complex juxtaposition of land-uses where conservation and economic production systems assume equal primacy and profoundly influence each other. Baseline analysis carried out during the project preparatory phase clearly shows that the project landscape has diverse characteristics i.e. striking range of biological diversity, contesting land-use assertions, ambitious developmental imperatives, contradictory sectoral directives, multitudes of actors and contrary aspirations. Cumulatively, these are contributing to injudicious use of natural resources and eventual disruption of vital ecological processes. Despite several years of developmental interventions, the landscape still has substantial area under natural vegetation (both primeval and under varying degrees of degradation). However, the rapidly altering developmental context, demographic contours, resource use configurations, and new and emerging challenges make the situation increasingly precarious for HRML's long-term ecological sustainability. An assessment of the existing and emerging challenges to biodiversity conservation in the project area reveals the following worrying scenario: a) rapidly eroding biological diversity (at genetic, species and ecosystem level); b) key habitats getting degraded or fragmented; c) proliferation of invasive alien species; d) increasing human-animal conflicts; e) climate change impedes ecosystem functionality; e) over-exploitation of natural resources; f) unfavourable practices in economic production sectors adversely affecting biodiversity; g) weakening capacity for sustainable resource use particularly among tribal communities; h) diminishing livelihoods based on natural resources; and g) production imperatives overriding conservation considerations.

It is evident from the above, that to repair and maintain the ecological integrity of the project landscape (HRML) will require a radical shift in the governance approach from the one that is currently being pursued. There is a need to pilot an alternate governance approach in HRML by promoting cross-sectoral coordinated planning, execution and compliance monitoring so that ecosystem integrity and life-support functions of the region are restored/ maintained for posterity. The aim is to broaden the constituency of conservation beyond the conservation sector and specifically to mainstream biodiversity considerations into the operations of economic production sectors. It is expected that this will enable them to minimize adverse impacts on biological diversity, manage potential trade-offs and promote win-win opportunities. The *long-term solution* proposed by the project is thus to build the know-how and put in place a collaborative governance mechanism for multiple-use management of HRML based on a landscape approach that secures PAs and outlying HVBAs, mainstreams biodiversity management into production sector operations and promote conservation-compatible livelihoods.

However, despite there being several baseline initiatives (across different sectors and actors; please see Prodoc, baseline project and summary below), they are not sufficiently coordinated to lessen pressure on biological diversity. The operations of individual agencies are very much sector-focused and the region lacks a comprehensive planning and governance framework that specifically integrates biodiversity conservation needs in production sector planning and

operations. Further, as is the case elsewhere in the country, the existing conservation framework in HRML is still 'Protected Area' centric. As PAs alone will not be able to secure the ecological future of HRML (due to their sub-optimal coverage and existing and emerging threats), it is imperative to adopt a broader integrated approach to biodiversity conservation. The prime strategy envisaged in the project is to influence the baseline investments so that they become more responsive to the needs of biodiversity conservation in the project landscape. The baseline investments may be broken into five parts, based on the source of funds as described below:

Investments by the national government:

India's National Environment Policy (2006) seeks to achieve balance between conservation and development by mainstreaming environmental concerns in developmental activities. Considering that the mountains are important but highly fragile ecosystems, National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP, 2008)[4] envisages major measures for conserving the mountain ecosystems. This project will align with India's ongoing programmes in mountain areas that evolve mostly from various programmes formulated by the Ministry of Environment and Forests; and complement the efforts of other related Ministries/Departments and affiliated agencies dealing with Agriculture, Water Resources, Rural Development, Commerce, Power, Industry, New and Renewable Energy, Tourism, Urban Development, and Science & Technology. These flagship programmes along with other complementary programmes have an approximate annual financial outlay of USD 10 billion (at the national level). One striking aspect to note at this juncture is that the scope, reach, and role of these programmes in designing landscape level resource management initiatives especially in mountain landscapes are rather weak and not well-defined. The project would fill up this void by piloting a landscape approach to biodiversity conservation.

The Central government provides technical and financial support for the establishment and conservation of Protected Areas, Biosphere Reserves, Tiger Reserves, Elephant Reserves and Reserve Forests in the mountain areas. On an average, the Government of India spends USD 100 million per annum specifically for the conservation of mountain areas under various centrally funded schemes (out of the total outlay of), *viz. Integrated Development of Wildlife Habitats (USD 15 million), Project Tiger (USD 50 million), Intensification of Forest Protection (USD 22 million), Project Elephant (USD five million)* and *National Afforestation & Eco-development Programme (USD 200 million).* Annual support from national government for protection, conservation and management of the eight PAs and five territorial Divisions in HRML amounts to USD 1.5 million. In PAs, funds are mostly directed towards strengthening protection and infrastructure, fire management etc. and to a limited extent, towards habitat improvement, ecorestoration, nature education etc. The funds for territorial divisions are mostly oriented towards consolidation, staff deployment, fortifying enforcement, reforestation through participatory forest management (PFM) and fire protection.

The national government also invests approximately USD 0.5 million per annum in HRML through the National Agriculture Development Programme (RKVY). Apart from direct support to agriculture through sustainable land management, improving productivity and enhancing market opportunities, RKVY also supports fisheries development, animal husbandry, popularization of temperate fruit crops, cool season vegetables, water harvesting and cardamom processing. More specifically, the National Horticulture Mission (USD two million) supports vegetable seed production, organic farming, creation of water sources, vermi-compost units, and integrated pest management. The Spices Board (USD one million) subsidizes replanting and rejuvenating small cardamom holdings, improving curing technologies, organic certification, quality control measures and market information and promotion to support the cardamom industry. The Coffee Board is marginally investing in replanting, quality upgradation, water quality management and pollution abatement, coffee processing etc. for small farmers; and the Tea Board is providing financial (USD one million) and technical assistance for tea cultivation under the Special Purpose Tea Fund Scheme for replanting and rejuvenation of old tea areas. Rubber Board invests USD 0.25 million per year for providing subsidies to new planting. Special Central Assistance (around USD 0.25 million) through Western Ghats Development Programme funds integrated development of water sheds in the landscape.

The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has an annual outlay of around USD 17 million in the HRML and supports enhanced livelihood security by guaranteeing wage employment for unskilled laborers comprising mostly of women. Water conservation, water harvesting, renovation of traditional water bodies, land development and rural sanitation are some of the major activities undertaken under this scheme. A special assistance programme from the Central government based on the Report- *Measures to Mitigate Agrarian Distress in Idukki District of Kerala* has earmarked around USD 10 million per annum for HRML for sustainable livelihoods and ecological security. The recommended activities include common infrastructure and service facilities, strengthening forest and tree cover, pisci-culture in reservoirs, promotion of rural marketing, water conservation, sustainable cardamom production, improved and community curing devices and revamping traditional farming systems. The funding for the activities outlined in the above Report are accessed from central and state agencies, commodity boards and other national programmes and missions.

---

[4] National Biodiversity Action Plan, 2008, MoEF, New Delhi

Investments from the state government:

The state government provides an outlay of around USD 1.5 million per annum for the management of PAs in HRML. In addition, it invests USD four million annually in managing the forests lying outside the PA system and the forest production sector (e.g. planting, timber operations, protection, infrastructure development etc.). Similarly, the State Agriculture Department invests approximately USD one million in HRML on various agricultural schemes aimed at development of vegetables and spices, market stabilization, soil conservation and strengthening agricultural extension. The Tourism Department has an annual budget of USD one million that is largely spent on planning and sprucing up tourism infrastructure in the landscape. The Scheduled Tribe Development Department has an annual outlay of about USD 0.5 million for various schemes such as housing, agriculture improvement, livestock rearing, drinking water and self employment schemes. Apart from this, Edamalakudy Tribal Panchayat has a special package of about USD two million mostly for housing and other infrastructure facilities. The state government also provides manpower and infrastructure for the implementation of the above-mentioned baseline projects.

Investments from Local self-governments and communities:

Local self-governments (*Panchayats*) have a strong presence in the landscape and carry out grass root level planning for economic development. They also implement various production sector programmes (e.g. agriculture, animal husbandry, fisheries, soil and water conservation, minor irrigation and small scale industries). The spending of local self-government that is relevant in the context of the project (on resource management) amounts to USD four million per annum. In addition, to enhance and strengthen the institutional capacity of local government system to deliver services and undertake basic administrative and governance functions more effectively and in a sustainable manner, the state government is implementing a Kerala Local Government Service Delivery Project. This has an outlay of around USD one million for the local self-government institutions in the project landscape.

Self Help Groups (SHGs) bring in important baselines related to this project's priority areas of intervention. They are engaged in helping communities recover socially and economically by promoting micro enterprises, linking to banks through kinship based institutions to access credit at the local level, helping people restore and improve their livelihoods through training and skill development, introduction of low cost, easy to adapt technologies, introducing business model approaches (links to markets), capacity development and trainings of the community members. Some of the baseline project initiatives brought in by these agencies include: bio-gas; renewable energy; solar applications for energy efficiency; livestock based fodder systems; promoting business models for milk production; livelihood improvement through training and skill development for microenterprises based on local biodiversity (e.g. NTFPs and medicinal plants); agricultural productivity restoration; etc. *Kudumbasree*, a flagship poverty eradication mission of the State Government with its ubiquitous presence in the landscape and linkages with various central and state government projects, has an investment of about USD five million through various microenterprises. Overall, community institutions like SHGs, JFMCs etc. also bring in complementary contributions to the tune of USD one million per annum through participation in forest protection, social mobilization, community welfare etc.

Investments from the production sectors:

The major production sectors in the landscape are cardamom, tea and tourism. Together they have significant investment in the landscape. The annual investment in tea industry comes to USD 25 million for activities like planting, soil and water conservation, fuel plantation management, weed management, disease and pest management, plucking and processing. Cardamom farmers invest around USD 50 million on activities like weed eradication, soil working, moisture conservation, shade management, harvesting and curing. The reed based industries and forest corporations together invest around USD two million for soft wood plantation management and reed extraction. The tourism industry which is a relatively new entrant into the landscape invests around USD five million annually for services and maintenance of infrastructure.

Investments from research institutions:

There are a few research institutions located in HRML conducting basic and applied research. They are: a) the Indian Cardamom Research Institute (ICRI), Myladumpara under the Indian Spices Board (the Union Ministry of Commerce and Industry): b) the Cardamom Research Station (CRS), Pampadumpara under the Kerala Agricultural University; and c) Research and Development Department of the Kannan Devan Hills Plantation Company (P) Ltd. Other research institutions that have a stake in the region are Centre for Earth Science Studies (CESS) and Kerala Forest Research Institute (KFRI) who take up specific projects related to natural resource management. These institutions look at crop improvement, sustainability, biotechnology, weather data, soil studies etc. The investments by these institutions would come to around USD one million per year.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities   requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF   financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project.

Recognizing the biodiversity significance of HRML, the government has established eight PAs in the region. However, given the escalating development pressures and need for sustaining livelihoods, it is unlikely that the current approach of conserving biodiversity in "exclusive PAs" alone is going to be effective in safeguarding the biological resources of HRML. The baseline investments in the project landscape comprise of diverse interventions undertaken by different sectors to further sectoral development objectives, but these interventions do not always integrate biodiversity conservation considerations. Further, these are not coordinated at the landscape level to provide a cross-sectoral strategic vision for balancing conservation, livelihood and production sector objectives. For instance, departmental budgets allocated to different sectors (agriculture, horticulture, animal husbandry, forests, and tourism) are primarily allocated to pursuing sectoral objectives through activities at the village/ settlement level. These activities are largely for the development of assets, but the development of institutional and individual capacities for balancing biodiversity conservation objectives with sector development objectives are not adequately addressed.

Under the baseline (business-as-usual) scenario, the trajectory of production activities in the project landscape and associated degradation trends are likely to continue as there remain persistent barriers to addressing the direct and indirect drivers of degradation. The existing planning and policy framework, as well as institutional arrangements in HRML are inadequate for addressing biodiversity conservation issues from a landscape perspective. Further there are significant gaps in the knowledge and experience related to the multiple-use management of mountain landscapes. Besides, in terms of making community resource use and livelihoods more sustainable, there is lack of robust community-based resource governance systems and alternatives. It is evident that far greater emphasis needs to be placed on mainstreaming biodiversity considerations into economic and livelihood activities in tandem with strengthening the management effectiveness of the existing PA system.

GEF support will be catalytic in mobilizing action by production sectors and other stakeholders to overcome such existing barriers and introduce new strategies and technologies that will improve the condition of natural resources and increase the stability and integrity of HRML. More importantly, building on the opportunities for community-based or stakeholder based resource management, it will promote a participatory natural resource planning and management strategy, involving production sectors, strengthening village level institutions, and developing capacity to enable stakeholders in undertaking micro-level planning and management of natural resources. It will enhance the capacity of functionaries of different sectors, private agencies, and CBOs to promote sustainable resource management.

The baseline projects comprise mostly of programmes of government agencies, private entrepreneurs, local self-government institutions, CBOs and research institutions in HRML relevant to biodiversity, poverty reduction and natural resource use. These programs form the bulk of this project's co-financing and GEF investment is designed to complement these baseline projects for creating a strategic shift in the development paradigm that is currently being pursued in HRML. GEF resources will enable baseline projects to more effectively focus upon and address key challenges to biodiversity governance and multiple use management in HRML. GEF funding will incrementally leverage new skills, practices and technologies through building capacities and demonstration of environment-friendly production practices across identified stakeholders. GEF resources will also be channeled for creating an enabling governance environment for the sustainable management of biodiversity of HRML through upstream policy and legal engagement both at national and state level. The GEF finance will be aligned in such a manner that the co-financing through baseline projects will be utilized in sectoral operations in a more biodiversity-friendly manner. GEF financing will provide additional assistance for cross-cutting capacity development, knowledge management and demonstration of new technologies that will fill a critical gap in the existing baseline project to enable the replication and scaling up of integrated approaches for biodiversity conservation. The baselines would help identify potential partners particularly the innovators, champions, early receptors, dissidents, early majority, late majority and the laggards in the projects and therefore help focus on developing clear strategies for project implementation. It will also identify areas where the GEF financing does not need to focus with a view to avoid duplication of efforts and resources.

The GEF alternative aims at making a change in natural resource management in the target project area by engaging with and coordinating efforts of different sectors in the landscape level to promote sustainable resource management which balances ecological and livelihood needs as an integral part of the operations of respective sectors. The Departments of Forests, Agriculture, Tourism, Rural Development and many large scale production agencies will align their resources in the target landscape for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in sector development strategies. The IC matrix details the baseline expenditures, and the incremental cost of realizing each Outcome, as well as how the incremental costs are to be shared by the GEF and different government departments. (Incremental Cost Matrix is at Annex 18 of the project document).

In the absence of this project, there are certain baseline investments/ interventions that would take place in HRML in the next five years. However most of the baseline investments will continue to be driven by the existing template (sectoral) driven resource planning and implementation. Some of these investments will have some positive impacts on biodiversity conservation in the region while majority will at best be neutral. However, in the context of the complex inter-related challenges confronting the project landscape, the baseline projects alone are unlikely to circumvent/ surmount the major barriers identified unless some key alterations are made in the governance approach. That is the space where GEF investment is trying to lock in. Nonetheless, the existing baseline projects provide a strong platform/ collateral funding/ support structures on which this project can anchor to influence the trajectory of development in the project landscape.

In short, the project seeks to put in place collaborative governance and know-how for multiple-use management of mountain landscapes to conserve biological diversity. This will have wider replication potential for other mountainous regions across India. The project will engineer a paradigm shift from current sector based and unsustainable practices to integrated multiple use management of mountain landscapes to deliver global environmental benefits as described in Table below:

Current Practice	Alternatives to be put in place by the project	Expected Global Benefits
Inadequate management effectiveness of the PA system: a) PAs are too small and do not adequately cover representative biodiversity; and b) management measures in PAs are sub-optimal in terms of addressing the emerging threats.	1. Coverage of PAs in the project landscape expanded by approximately 11,600 ha over the baseline. 2. PA functions improved to account for existing and emerging threats including human-animal conflicts (covering 500,00 ha). 3. Wildlife populations ranging into PA's adjacent landscape (> 400,000 ha) secured—thus indirectly sustaining their ecological integrity.	1. PA systems cover more representative areas of global biodiveristy significance (e.g. *shola*-grasslands). 2. Population status of several globally significant species maintained or increased – e.g. *1. Nilgiri tahr; 2. Grizzled giant squirrel; 3. Tiger;4: Leopard 5: Nilgiri marten 6: Clawless otter 7: Asian elephant;8:Gaur* 3. The prospects of discovering species new to science particularly from lesser known life forms. 4. Production of knowledge about multiple use management of biodiversity rich areas. 5. Expansion of PA network and coverage of more globally significant biodiversity under PA systems. 6. Reduced forest degradation and improved vegetal cover contribute to significant carbon sequestration and improving ecosystem functions.
Limited protection accorded to biological diversity outside the PA systems: Extensive areas of HVBAs and forest fragments face growing threats from unsustainable use and land use change—threatening vital animal movement corridors, habitat loss and degradation.	1. Landscape Level Land-Use and Sectoral Plans developed and a functional cross-sectoral institutional mechanism established for the sustainable management of HRML. 2. Key HVBAs and forest fragments in the project landscape identified, mapped, conservation/ eco-restoration plan prepared and implementation support provided by reorienting baseline investments. 3. Conservation sector staff capacitated on improved conservation practices, collaborative governance, stakeholder engagement, eco-restoration, etc (applicable to PA staff too).	1. Extensive areas of HVBAs and forest fragments (totaling 84,600 hectares) brought under improved conservation management and function as stepping stone corridors/ 'escape routes' ensuring species and genetic flow across the whole of southern Western Ghats. This is particularly important to ensure the survival of high altitude species threatened by climate change (e.g. Black and rufous flycatcher). It is also critical to ensure the survival of species such as tiger and elephant which need large home ranges. 2. Restored HVBAs and forest fragments act the foci for the revival of lost habitats of several threatened and globally significant species (e.g. Great Indian hornbill, *Impatiens* spp). 3. Avoided forest cover loss and augmented ecorestoration contribute to significant carbon sequestration and improving ecosystem functions. 4. The prospects of discovering species new to science particularly from lesser known life-forms.
Production sectors do not adopt	1. Formulation of biodiversity-friendly	1. Production sectors develop capacities for

sustainable practices: a) economic production activities have limited focus, capacities and technologies that are less detrimental to ecology; b) production sectors have limited market opportunities for adopting ecologically sustainable activities.	Sector Plans for mainstreaming biodiversity considerations into production sector practices. 2. Production sector stakeholders capacitated on biodiversity mainstreaming concepts and approaches. 3. Focused implementation support and transfer of knowhow (e.g. energy efficiency options in curing operations) to key production sectors as in designing and implementing biodiversity-friendly production practices. 4. Business models, market mechanisms and branding developed to incentivize sustainable resource use.	mainstreaming biodiversity considerations into their operations and practices across 200,000 ha area—reducing the negative ecological foot print on biodiversity and sustaining critical wildlife blocks. 2. Production sector operations have adverse minimal impacts on the regional ecology and functionality of key ecosystems improves. 3. Adoption of environmentally sound production practices (e.g. energy efficiency options, waste management etc.) leads to reduction in GHG emission. 4. Production of ecologically benign goods and services (e.g. tea, cardamom and tourism) for the consumption of global communities.
Community institutions fail to sustainably govern land and resource use: Community capacities for effective management of natural resources are weakening and livelihoods shrinking.	1. Local self governments and community institutions incorporate improved practices for managing wild resource use to ensure sustainability. 2. Market mechanisms developed (certification for sustainably produced farm products and NTFPs) for sustainable use of natural resources. 3. A holistic governance model based on natural resources developed for the tribal Panchayat at Edamalakkudy.	1. Community incomes augmented, socio-economic situation improved – providing a utilitarian incentive for conservation and improving conservation status and security. 2. Uptake, replication and mainstreaming of community models on improved resource management into legal, policy and programme framework. 3. Improved conservation status of heavily utilized species (i.e. NTFPs and medicinal plants) and conservation of local varieties. 4. Increasing the adaptive capacity and resilience of women and other marginalized communities.

A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks.

Risk/ Assumption	Rating	Mitigation Strategy
Limited support from production sector due to apprehension that their economic interests would be jeopardized due to participation in the planned conservation interventions	M	The production sectors operating in the HRML (tea, cardamom , tourism etc.) are critically dependent on natural resources. Depletion of natural resources shall inevitably act against the sustainability of these sectors in the long run; a fact that will be used as a spring board for engaging with production enterprises. Necessary measures (including both technical and market based instruments) shall be undertaken by the project (under Outcome 2) to influence their production practices and choices. Further, production sector representatives will be key participants in the cross-sectoral institutional platform to be established by the project (under Outcome 1). Knowledge products will be developed highlighting the benefits of a well-governed mountain landscape. In addition, the project will identify appropriate technological options/ incentives that would be beneficial to these sectors and form part of the Landscape Level Land Use Plan (Outcome 1).
Policy amendments and regulations for addressing biodiversity conservation in sector practices may not receive government and political support	M	In amending policies and the regulatory framework, a highly consultative approach will be used drawing on reviews and inputs from various stakeholders (government, private sector, communities, local bodies and academicians) to ensure the feasibility and acceptability of the proposed changes. The proposed cross-sectoral multi-stakeholder institutional platform (HRSDS) to be set under the project shall lead this process in consultation with key ministries. Similarly, the knowledge products generated under the project shall be disseminated widely for lobbying for upstream policy uptakes of the project concepts.
Local communities may not be willing to participate in the project unless the project addresses their livelihood needs	L	The project will work closely with the local communities by providing technical and financial support for engendering sustainable use of natural wild resources. Planned interventions include skill upliftment, value addition to on-farm and forest produce shall result in income augmentation of communities. The project will also recognize the traditional knowledge of local communities and fully integrate this in designing

		management interventions. These interventions will be developed with the full participation of communities.
The benefits generated by the project may be offset by the impacts of climate change	M	Climate proofing is an important element in the project design. To start with, the project proposes to address this risk by building a better understanding on the impacts of climate change on HRML (Output 1.1). The findings of this study will give inputs into the process of landscape-level planning – key focus being on maintaining connectivity across the landscape, and maintaining functional diversity (both crucial in enhancing the resilience of ecosystems to climate change induced fire, drought and other perturbations). Further, by reducing existing anthropogenic stressors to ecosystems, the project will enhance the capacity of ecosystems to recover from such climate change triggered perturbations.
Stakeholders may perceive the project as restrictive rather than enabling due to its focus on biodiversity.	M	The project aims to mainstream biodiversity as enabling element rather than counter pose it against development. The project approach is to balance conservation, development and livelihoods. Right at the beginning of the project this fact shall be disseminated widely among diverse stakeholder groups. Further, the capacity strengthening programmes and the demonstration approach envisaged in the project will lead to better appreciation of the benefits of sustainable development and biodiversity conservation. Project is also expected to unleash the potentials of new technology and marketing strategies that are anchored in biodiversity friendliness.
The history of the landscape is replete with efforts to establish rights over land and the idea of a landscape level plan may appear to be pitted against existing tenurial interests.	M	Project stresses on evolving clarity on land tenure and harmonization of Acts and policies which would, in fact, dispel the vagueness associated with the present compartmentalized way of dealing with land and resource related issues. The project will support efforts towards settling land rights and untangle the complex land related issues in the landscape. Further, one of the main thrust areas of the project is securing the rights of tribal communities as the Forest Rights Act.
Resources of the project are insufficient for meeting the objectives over the large area of the landscape	M	The project design adopts principles of incremental reasoning over baseline investments. More emphasis is given to develop soft skills, institution building, policy enabling and shift in development trajectory rather than focusing on building physical infrastructure. It is presumed that the catalytic investments from the project will enable channelizing/ realigning the baseline investments in congruence with the needs of biodiversity conservation. Moreover, the demonstration approach adopted by the project will help rationalizing the utilization of project resources.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

India has implemented several programmes, over the past two decades that specifically sought to strengthen institutional structures at different levels (national and sub-national) to create an enabling environment for biodiversity conservation. An earlier GEF financed project – *India Eco-development Project (1996-2004)* – has shown that providing sustainable livelihoods to communities is central to the success of conservation, and lessons from this project have resulted in major upstream policy changes (e.g. amendment of the national wildlife legislation in 2006). The proposed GEF project shall add another layer to the existing framework of conservation in India (that still remains PA centric) by engaging production sectors and promoting integrated landscape management approaches to safeguard biodiversity in mountain landscapes. As already mentioned in Section A.3, the GEF-UNDP-Gulf project - *Mannar Biosphere Reserve project*, wherein an integrated, multi-sectoral approach was adopted to secure the critical linkage between improved coastal and marine resources and the local livelihoods, is particularly relevant in the context of this project. Equally relevant would be the two ongoing projects under the *India: GEF-UNDP- Coastal and Marine Programme* that aims at mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into production sector operations in the critically vulnerable coastal and marine zones of Godavari, Andhra Pradesh (east-coast) and Sindhudurg, Maharashtra (west-coast). The project will establish necessary communication and coordination mechanisms (through the Ministry of Environment and Forests, National Project Management Units and Project Steering Committees) with this programme. Further, a GEF-UNDP Project- *Energy Conservation in Small Sector Tea processing Units in Southern India* has demonstrated that by adopting energy efficient options in tea curing units, there could be 20 percent savings in electrical and thermal energy leading to significant reduction in dependence on biomass and GHG emission. This learning would be dove-tailed into the proposed project in the tea and cardamom sector. Similarly, a couple of other initiatives – *Community Based Natural Resource Management* and the GEF *Small Grants Programme* – have developed models of viable and ecologically sustainable "community owned ecosystem based enterprises" with high replication potential. The proposed project shall build on the lessons learned and experiences gained from these projects. The project will also coordinate with the Critical Ecosystems

Partnership Fund (CEPF) that is investing in community and CSO conservation actions to preserve and protect globally threatened species and habitats in the Western Ghats. Efforts will be made to ensure synergies, sharing of lessons and cross-fertilization of ideas between the two. Similarly, through inviting participation in the Project Steering Committee at the national level, synergy and coordination with the Global Tiger Initiative (GTI) of the World Bank and GEF will also be guaranteed. The project will also build synergies and coordinate with the upcoming WB managed "Integrated Biodiversity Conservation and Ecosystem Services Improvement Project" with planned site level interventions in the northern Western Ghats (of the three pilot sites). Several means to coordinate are suggested such as inviting participation in respective PSC (project board), field level coordination between the local coordination structures of the two projects, and cross-visits and sharing of lessons and good practices. Moreover, specific outputs such as those related to capacity building could also benefit from joint design and implementation – example joint trainings, development of training curricula together through National training institutes such as IGNFA.

In addition, the project will coordinate actions with other government and non-government initiatives where similarities in the strategy of the proposed project open up an opportunity for cross fertilizing good practices. To facilitate coordination, the managers of each of the three landscape projects implemented by UNDP will be tasked with working together to complete a detailed coordination plan. Ideally, the plan will be formulated during project inception, but no later than the first year of project activity. This joint coordination plan will identify coordination opportunities and specify coordination actions to be taken during project implementation. This will include both formal (e.g., yearly coordination meetings, joint training programs) and informal mechanisms (e.g., expertise sharing, dissemination of lessons learned and materials generated) for information exchange.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

The preparatory phase of the project placed strong emphasis on stakeholder participation. The project has benefitted from the feedback and support from various stakeholders obtained through both formal and informal consultation. The PPG phase has opened up channels of communication with diverse stakeholders which is key to the successful implementation of the project. This same inclusive approach will be continued during project implementation. Stakeholder involvement is critical to the effective achievement of all three project Outcomes. The text below gives a description of major stakeholders and the nature of their involvement in the project. An extended summary of the institutional context is narrated in the Project Document (Annexure 14).

There is a multitude of stakeholders for the project ranging from central and state governments, sectoral agencies/ departments, private entrepreneurs, community organizations, NGOs and local communities. As the project is focusing on resource use over a fairly larger landscape, key stakeholders, stakeholder interests, priorities and capacities vary vastly. Broadly, stakeholder affinities in HRML revolve around aspects of exclusive conservation, participatory resource management, sustainable use, ecosystem based enterprises, resource apportions and appropriations, commercial considerations and access to markets. Climate change, decentralized planning, empowering the disadvantaged and balancing gender are cross-cutting interests.

In terms of government representatives, the Kerala Forest Department (KFD) is the key stakeholder (the principal anchor of the project) given its mandate for forest protection and biodiversity conservation. The main functions of KFD are to: a) conserve and expand the natural forests; b) increase the productivity of forest plantations through appropriate management interventions and modern technology; c) increase the tree cover both inside and outside the forests; d) meet the livelihood needs of tribals and other forest dependent communities; and e) sustainably manage biodiversity-rich and sensitive ecosystems such as mangroves, sacred groves, coastal areas, wetlands, homesteads, private plantations etc. that are outside the control of the Forest Department.[5] One of the main aims of the project is to capacitate KFD to deal with the existing and emerging threats in HRML.

Agriculture Department is another important entity as large area of the project landscape is under agriculture land use. Other government agencies that are important stakeholders include the Tourism, Revenue and Local Self Government (LSG) Departments who facilitate tourism, administration of revenue land and local bodies respectively. Animal Husbandry Department provides veterinary care and supports improving the production potential of livestock and poultry. The Fisheries Department is a stakeholder as they support inland fisheries. The Public Works Department has a role as infrastructure development have direct bearing on the landscape. Department of Science, Technology & Environment has prominent role on matters related to environment while Pollution Control and Biodiversity Boards are mandated to implement Environment Protection Act and Biological Diversity Act respectively. The Electricity Board is a major entity in the landscape and deal with dams and reservoirs. Irrigation Department and Water Authority shall be key stakeholders for issues related to water management

---

[5]Available from http://keralaforest.gov.in/ Accessed on February 8, 2013

At the field level, District administration is an important stakeholder and is headed by the District Collector and includes functionaries responsible for different aspects of governance. Of relevance to this project are officials responsible for administration (Revenue Divisional Officer), district planning (District Planning Officer), fisheries (Assistant Director of Fisheries), agriculture (Deputy Director, Agriculture), livestock (District Animal Husbandry Officer), tribal development (Project Officer, Integrated Tribal Development Programme), tourism (District Tourism Promotion Council). At the Divisional level, forest and wildlife units are headed by Deputy Conservator of Forests/ Assistant Conservator of Forests.

Local government institutions such as Gramsabhas and other PRIs are important stakeholders as they operate at the grassroots and decisively influence the land use in the project landscape and extensively interact with local communities. The key stakeholder group for the project is the local community especially tribals who are highly vulnerable to resource depletion due to their dependency on natural resources. The primary entry-point for engaging communities in the project will be Community Based Organizations (CBOs) such as *Kudumbashree*, JFMCs, VSSs, EDCs, CRC, FDAs, and SHGs.

Private sector is another important stakeholder and partner for the project as they have tenuous dependence on natural resources and sustainable use is vital for their own existence in the long-run. Right at an early stage, the project will develop collaboration and promote proactive engagement with the private sector. Partnerships shall be built with institutions like United Planters Association of South India (UPASI-plantation sector), Kerala Travel Mart Society (KTM) and tour operators (tourism sector), cardamom growers and Kannan Devan Plantation Ltd. for imparting biodiversity and sustainability concerns into their production practices. Linkages shall also be established with entrepreneurs willing to invest in green technologies like renewable energy, waste management, organic value added products etc.

Research Institutions – national, regional and local, need to be involved in the project for research, innovation, education and implementation. Wildlife Institute of India, National Centre for Biological Sciences, Botanical Survey of India, Zoological Survey of India, College of Forestry, Kerala Agriculture University, Indian Cardamom Research Institute, Kerala Forest Research Institute, School of Social Sciences, Mahatma Gandhi University, Centre for Earth Science Studies (CESS), IMG, Periyar Foundation, Institute of Management in Government (IMG) and Kerala Institute of Travel and Tourism Studies (KITTS) are institutions of excellence in research and capacity building relevant to the project. Kerala Institute of Local Administration (KILA) is an important institution for strengthening capacity of the Panchayats. The project will develop a network of these organizations for mobilizing knowledge, technology and expertise for various project activities.

NGOs like High Range Environment and Wildlife Preservation Association (HRWEPA), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Wildlife Trust of India (WTI), Nature Conservation Foundation (NCF), Hornbill Foundation, Vattakanal Conservation Trust, Gurukula Botanical Garden etc. have important stakeholder roles in promoting awareness on conservation and sustainable resource use. Representatives from political class and audio-visual and print media are important partners in highlighting the need to mainstream biodiversity conservation and also project achievements during implementation.

Stakeholders at the national level bring requisite information, knowledge, skills and practices relevant for the project. As mentioned above, MoEF is the central Ministry for planning, promoting, coordinating and overseeing implementation of India's environmental, forestry, land degradation, climate change related policies and programmes. Other union ministries who will be important stakeholders of the project are the Ministry of Agriculture (National Agricultural Policy, 2000); Ministry of Rural Development and Land Resources (Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 (MGNREGA); Ministry of Tribal Affairs (Schedule Tribes and other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006*);* the Ministry of Panchayati Raj (issues related to PRIs*);* Ministry of Power, Ministry of New and Renewable Energy (issues related to energy conservation and energy efficiency), Ministry of commerce (Commodity Boards of tea, cardamom and rubber) and the Ministry of Tourism (National Tourism Policy, 2002). The project will link with the programmes of these Ministries and seek and leverage collateral support, and also promote upstream policy engagement for mainstreaming environmental considerations into their sectoral operations for deriving local/global environment benefits.

For over a decade, UNDP India has been leveraging funds from GEF for the national government for fortifying its biodiversity conservation programmes. The landscape approach (adopted in this project) is already being piloted in two ongoing GEF funded UNDP managed projects (*India: Coastal and Marine Programme*) and links have been made with MoEF for facilitating actions with other Union Ministries and State Governments for allocating resources for scaling up, and solving issues around policy on replication and mainstreaming. The present project intends to upscale the reach and scope of these interventions and initiatives.

Project oversight and management

The project will be executed under Direct Implementation Modality (DIM), according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of India, and the Country Program Action Plan (CPAP). The project is

financed with funding from the GEF co-financed by the Ministry of Environment and Forests and the Kerala State Government. UNDP acts as the GEF Executing Agency.

Implementing Partner (IP): The project will be directly implemented by UNDP in close cooperation with Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF). UNDP and the Ministry of Environment and Forests will be responsible for the effective use of resources and the achievement of the project outcomes and outputs as set forth in the document. The Ministry of Environment and Forests will designate a nodal officer for the project. UNDP will be responsible for all financial management, reporting, procurement and recruitment services. UNDP recruitment and procurement rules will apply.

Project Steering Committees: Oversight of project level activities will be provided by the Project Steering Committees (PSCs). There will be two Steering Committees - one, at the national level and the other, at the State level. National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) will be jointly chaired by a senior official from UNDP and the Additional Director General of Forests (Wildlife), Ministry of Environment and Forests. The NPSC will comprise the Inspector General of Forests (Wildlife), GEF Operational Focal Point, Joint Secretary (in charge of Mountains), Joint Secretary (in charge of Biodiversity), representatives from Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Commerce, Tourism, Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Ministry of Panchayati Raj, Ministry of New and Renewable Energy, Chairman, National Biodiversity Authority, the Chief Wildlife Warden, Kerala; two representatives of UNDP; and two non-government representatives (including one from private sector/ industries) nominated jointly by the MoEF and UNDP. The Chairmen can also invite other officials and experts to the NPSC meetings on as-needed basis. The NPSC will be responsible for overall programme effectiveness and relevance for policy. The NPSC will also be responsible for approving the budgeted AWPs forwarded by the State and providing overall guidance and oversight on policy matters. NPSC meeting will be convened at least once a year. But efforts will be made to organize quarterly/half yearly meetings to ensure regular follow up. State Project Steering Committee (SPSC) will be established in the state with representation from key state Departments/ Agencies to direct and oversee project implementation and management at the state level. SPSC will be jointly chaired by the Chief Secretary, Kerala and a senior official from UNDP. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Kerala shall be the ex-officio Secretary. Other members will include representatives of the relevant State Departments, Finance (Expenditure), Planning Board, Agencies, representatives of MOEF and other stakeholders including private sector/ industries nominated by the State Government. The SPSC shall meet at least twice a year to review the progress of project implementation and take corrective measures where required for the smooth implementation of the project. The SPSC shall ensure that key officials involved in the project will have sufficient tenure for effective functioning. Further, SPSC may also constitute a Working Committee under the chairmanship of Secretary, Forests to take necessary administrative decisions on a regular basis. The SPSC should recommend to line departments specific actions in the form of administrative decisions and resource allocation which will compliment project activities to meet the broader developmental outcomes. The SPSC should monitor the co-financing commitments and should make efforts to ensure that developmental and scheme commitments of the state towards the project are met. In addition, both the PSCs will be responsible for regular project reviews to ensure that the agreed deliverables are produced satisfactorily according to plans and timelines; assess and decide to proceed on project changes through appropriate revisions and arbitrate on any conflicts within the project or negotiate a solution to emerging problems.

In order to ensure UNDP's ultimate accountability, PSC decisions will be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In addition, the PSC plays a critical role in project evaluations are of a high quality and using evaluations for performance improvement. The developmental outcomes that the project seeks to achieve requires supportive action by related Ministries and Departments, so both the Project Steering Committees will be expected to advocate for these developmental initiatives.

National Project Management Unit (NPMU) will be the administrative hub for the project will be supported with one full-time Project Manager (PM). PM shall report to the MoEF Nodal Officer and UNDP Country Office on all matters related to project implementation. The Project Manager will assist in coordinating with the State Government of Kerala, UNDP, State Nodal Officer, LLPMU and other agencies and Stakeholders. The NPMU shall also coordinate exchange of information and also open channels of communication with other similar programmes/ projects in the country for ensuring synergy and initiating upstream policy engagements. The NPMU will also include a Technical Coordinator and a Financial cum Admin Assistant.

State Nodal Officer: Government of Kerala will designate an appropriate officer above the rank of Chief Conservator of Forests (preferably who is in charge of the project landscape) as the State nodal officer. The State Nodal Officer will be responsible for overall implementation of the project at the State level, including adherence to the AWP and achievement of planned results as outlined in the Project Document, and for the use of project funds through effective management and well established project review and oversight mechanisms. The State Nodal officer will head the Landscape Level Project Management Unit (LLPMU) and ensure coordination with UNDP, MoEF, various Departments and Agencies; provide guidance to the project team; review reports and look after other administrative and financial arrangements related to the project.

<u>Landscape Level Project Management Unit (LLPMU):</u> The implementation of the project at the landscape level will be carried out through LLPMU. The LLPMU will initially be located in the State Forest Department. Once the High Range Sustainable Development Society (HRSDS) is setup by the project as visualized in output 1.4 of the project document, the LLPMU will be hosted by this society. The HRSDS is envisaged as a cross-sectoral institutional platform and will be a registered body represented by all key stakeholders in the High Range Mountain Landscape (HRML) (including private sector/ industries/local communities) and may have a Governing Board, General Body and Advisory Committee. The HRSDS could be registered under the relevant State Act meant for the purpose. Apart from implementing the project, LLPMU may also: 1) develop general policy and overall programmes for the HRML, 2) receive, control, invest and disburse all funds provided for the project, 3) promote research into the scientific, sociological and economic aspects of landscape and integrate into landscape and sector plans, 4) coordinate with different production sectors and other agencies to develop an environmentally sustainable strategic plan for HRML, 5) promote programs for the sustainable livelihood options of the communities dependent on the HRML, and 6) provide a long-term institutional sustainability strategy for the project beyond project period, etc.

The LLPMU will engage Subject Specialists (SSs) to extend technical assistance to the project. The LLPMU will comprise of a State Project Coordinator (SPC), Conservation Biologist (1), Socio-Economic and Livelihood Specialist (1), Communication and Outreach specialist (1), and a Financial – cum - Administrative Assistant (FA). Under the direct supervision of State Nodal Officer, the SPC will lead the project team and ensure that the project activities are proceeding as per schedule and facilitate effective implementation of the project. The key responsibilities for the LLPMU will include: 1) coordinating project implementation with all stakeholders, State Government and central government agencies and UNDP-GEF; 2) organizing the project evaluations; 3) ensuring that there is adequate documentation by all implementing partners at all stages and in collating this documentation; and 4) facilitating the publication of project outputs. LLMPU will also have a Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) comprising of elected representatives and other local stakeholders who shall provide regular guidance and feedback to the project activities.

SSs will provide technical leadership and support for the project implementation, monitoring & evaluation, and adaptive management. In addition, there will be support staff for performing the day to day administrative and financial functions of the LLPMU. The key responsibilities of the SSs will include: 1) provide strong technical leadership and strategically important inputs to the project during its implementation 2) provide advice and guidance in the implementation of the project, 3) to ensure that the project achieves its overall objective and outcomes as identified in the project document, 4) provide high levels of coordination during project inception and implementation at landscape and sector levels, 5) ensure sharing and flow of information in a transparent manner among all project stakeholders as appropriate, 6) support the LLPMU in the overall management of the project and to ensure coherence between all components of the project and implementing partners, 7) provide advice and assistance to organize and conduct various consultations, workshops and trainings, 8) provide advice related to the AWPs, 9) participate in the recruitment of subcontractors and consultants, 10) ensure strong quality control and provide advisory support as required, 11) contribute to resource mobilization and development of partnerships to further the objectives of the   project, and 12) contribute to the establishment of a monitoring and evaluation plan and system for the project.

The National Project Management Unit (NPMU) and Landscape level Project Management Unit (LLPMU) will prepare a budgeted Work Plan on an annual basis, as per UNDP rules and regulations, which will be shared with the Ministry of Environment and Forests for comments and inputs. Approved copy of the AWP will be provided to GEF – OFP India office as well. The AWP will programme both GEF grants and project co-finance approved by GEF CEO.

The project results will be reviewed at the Country Programme Management Board (CPMB) comprising DEA and UNDP. The oversight will consist, at a minimum, of a six monthly review (at the end of the second quarter) and an annual strategic review (in the last quarter of the year) between DEA and UNDP. The recommendations from the annual review will be used to update and adjust the annual work plan and budgets for the coming year, if required. UNDP will enter into agreement(s) with other organizations or entities for providing goods and services to the project, carry out project activities and produce project outputs. UNDP will designate an official from UNDP who will work in close consultation with nodal officers designated by the Ministry of Environment and Forests and the State Government. NPMU and LLPMU details are provided in a separate section below. The PM and the SPC will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the programme. They will coordinate the Project activities including the preparation of Annual and Quarterly Work Plans, Budget, Financial Reports, etc. and will interface on project management issues. The PM/ SPC will be responsible for:

- Managing the overall conduct of the project;
- Implementing activities by mobilizing goods and services;
- Checking on progress and watch for plan deviations;
- Regular progress reporting to the PSC;
- Ensuring that changes are controlled and problems addressed;
- Monitoring progress and risks;

- Reporting on progress including measures to address challenges and opportunities.
- Coordinate the Project activities including the preparation of Annual and Quarterly Work Plans, Budget, Financial Reports, etc;
- Capture lessons learnt during project implementation
- Prepare the annual review report/ project implementation report (PIR), and submit the report to the PSC.

<u>Project Assurance</u> will be the responsibility of UNDP. The Assurance role will support the NPSC by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. During the implementation of the project, this role ensures (through periodic monitoring, assessment and evaluations) that appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed.   The assurance will:

- Ensure that funds are made available to the project;
- Ensure the project is making progress towards intended outputs;
- Perform regular monitoring activities, such as periodic monitoring visits and spot checks;
- Ensure that resources entrusted to UNDP are utilized appropriately;
- Ensure that critical project information is monitored and updated
- Ensure that financial reports are submitted to UNDP on time, and that combined delivery reports are prepared and submitted to the NPSC and SPSC;
- Ensure that risks are properly identified, managed, and monitored on regular basis.

 An independent external review may be conducted through resource persons/groups to feed into this process. The UNDP official responsible for the Project Assurance and the PM will meet on a quarterly basis to assess progress of the decisions taken in the PSC.

<u>Funds Flow Arrangements and Financial Management:</u>

The project follows DIM (Direct Implementation) modality and UNDP takes on the role of implementing partner.

- The project will be directly implemented by UNDP in close cooperation and consultation of Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF).
- In this case, UNDP assumes the responsibility for mobilizing and applying effectively the required inputs in order to reach the expected outputs. UNDP assumes overall management responsibility and accountability for project implementation. Accordingly UNDP would follow all policies and procedures established for its own operations and will be responsible for all financial management, reporting, procurement and recruitment services.
- UNDP and MoEF will jointly prepare a budgeted Annual Work Plan on an Annual basis, as per UNDP rules and regulations. The AWP will be shared with GEF OFP India Office.
- UNDP may identify Responsible Parties to carry out activities within a DIM project. A Responsible Party is defined as an entity that has been selected to act on behalf of the UNDP on the basis of a written agreement or contract to purchase goods or provide services using the project budget. All Responsible Parties are directly accountable to UNDP in accordance with the terms of their agreement or contract with UNDP. The Responsible Party may follow its own procedures only to the extent that they do not contravene the principles of the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP. Where the financial governance of the responsible party, does not provide the required guidance to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency, and effective international competition that of UNDP shall apply.

B.2. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The project's national and local benefits will follow primarily from the maintenance of critical ecosystem goods and services delivered by HRML. This includes: hydrological functions; pollution control, water filtration and storage; providing highly valuable subsistence and livelihood opportunities from tourism and NTFPs, climate control, preservation of locations with high cultural value etc. Protection of ecosystem services provided by HRML delivers a substantial financial opportunity and cost-savings for the national and state government. However, these benefits will be felt most directly by residents who live in and/or proximate to HRML. There are an estimated 700,000 persons living within the project landscape. Each of these persons is directly or indirectly dependent upon the natural resources of HRML for sustenance and quality of life. As is the case elsewhere, women are more closely associated with natural resources in HRML and any degradation to these resources shall significantly impact them. This project will help to stabilize these valuable ecosystem services that will have significant positive bearings on socio-economic conditions.

More directly, the project will support community based institutions (especially that of tribal communities) on sustainable resource management. A three pronged strategy is adopted towards this: a) community based organizations (*Kudumbasree* (a state supported women's programme), local self-governments, JFMCs, Gramasabhas and SHGs) will be capacitated on sustainable resource use; b) support to resource use practices that accentuate positive resource dependency; and c) demonstration of a holistic community-based natural resource governance model for the unique tribal local self-government at Edamalakudy. The project will provide technical and financial support to Panchayats to develop Panchayat level resource use plans for greening the land-use investments such as code of conduct for green development; increased income generating opportunities through green options (e.g. tourism cess, leveraging CSR/ CER commitments from production sector); waste management etc. Further, the project will also earmark resources to revitalize the existing JFMCs/ BMCs by building their capacities to enter into co-management agreements with Forest Department and other institutions that will prescribe: i) resource off-take limits; ii) zones where harvesting can take place; iii) mechanisms for monitoring and enforcement including community sanctions against defaulters; iv) marketing mechanism; and v) internal democratic and equitable benefit sharing mechanism. The effectiveness of these interventions will be evidenced by: a) reduction on pressure on biodiversity (e.g. illicit felling of sandal trees); b) population of key harvested species (e.g. medicinal plants) remain stable or increase through-out project period; and c) 15 percent increase in the income of local communities attributed to biodiversity-friendly enterprises.

Women shall comprise more than 50 percent of the target beneficiaries. The project will expend efforts in carrying out, wherever possible, gender analysis for the design and analysis of such interventions. *Quid pro quo* commitments shall be dove-tailed into the plans regarding livelihood support provided under the project and improved biodiversity conservation practices to be followed by the communities. The project will also support biodiversity-friendly businesses as identified in the micro-plans of JFMCs and Resource Plans of Panchayats/ Gramasabhas which will include artisanal enterprises (e.g. reed mat weaving), community based tourism, NTFP based enterprises etc. To ensure that these enterprises remain viable, the project will strengthen technical, financial, administrative and marketing capacities. In addition, to ensure that businesses with negative impacts on biodiversity are not promoted inadvertently, the project will put in place safeguards for financial and business management support. The project will support adoption of innovative technology for bringing in use efficiency (e.g. lemon grass distillation) and better value realization of products (e.g. NTFPs, artisanal reed products etc.). It is anticipated that the catalytic investments from the project will provide economic and financial incentives to switch over from short-term resource exploitation to long-term stewardship. Further, the project will explore options for creating new institutional mechanisms for the extraction and management of reeds through tribal communities under the Forest Rights Act. In addition, this project will establish institutional partnership with KILA (a key state level institution for training local self-governments) to develop training modules on sustainable resource use for Panchayat members. Customized training programmes will also be developed for tribals on natural resources use and effective implementation of the Forest Rights Act (e.g. Edamalakudy Panchayat). It is anticipated that such models will also serve as learning references for replication among other exclusive tribal Panchayats across the country in the context of implementation of the Forest Rights Act, 2006. In addition, ensuring ecological stability in production sectors through mainstreaming approaches, would have additional socio-economic benefits such as sustained livelihoods in economic production sectors, reduced health hazards (e.g. cardamom and tea) etc.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

In tune with the GEF Council's guidance on assessing project cost-effectiveness (Cost Effectiveness Analysis in GEF Projects, GEF/C.25/11, April 29, 2005), the PPG team has taken a qualitative approach to identify the most cost-effective strategy for achieving the project objective. Several scenarios for improving the long-term sustainable management of natural resources of HRML's unique biodiversity heritage have been considered, and the prominent three among these are described below.

One option would have been to continue with the business-as-usual scenario of pursuing conservation objectives through the existing PA network. However, the current paradigm of resource management in HRML is complex with diverse baselines, disparate issues, multi-faceted challenges, divergent governance models, and varied stakeholder interests; most of which are emanating from outside the PA network. Notwithstanding several initiatives undertaken so far, mostly by the government, the natural resource governance in the region remains weak due to limited inter-sectoral coordination on developmental decisions, knowledge and capacity gaps, institutional barriers, limited technology support, poor realization of economic potential of natural resources, limited integration of policies and actions across line agencies on resource management, unclear mandate of community institutions on sustainable resource management etc. Further, a major challenge in this regard is supporting/ mobilizing community institutions to take up effective resource management. This has been found to be a tough proposition in the conventional approach. In the business-as-usual scenario, this trend is likely to remain the same or may even worsen especially in the context of fast developments taking place in the landscape. Furthermore, even if this approach were to succeed, given the escalating threats from anthropogenic activities in the wider landscape, irreparable losses of existing values, option values and future use values could still result. Moreover, the existing PA network provides only sub-optimal coverage of representative biodiversity in the region and

does not encompass the entire range of ecological and biological values of HRML. Large chunks of biodiversity rich areas lie outside the purview of the PA system and often are embedded in economic production systems. As a result, efforts to strengthen the management effectiveness of existing PAs alone are unlikely to yield significant conservation dividends. Hence, to continue with the single-sector approach, wherein the conservation sector focuses solely on the existing PAs is considered less likely to succeed and critical biodiversity and ecosystem values will continue to erode.

A second option would be to expand the territorial extent of the PAs, which might provide greater security for biodiversity values. This approach surely has some potential, but may not be a complete solution in itself given the development pressures and competing economic and livelihood interests. It may be feasible to expand HRML's PA network to some extent, but a large extension of the PA system is unlikely to gain the necessary community and political support to succeed. Keeping this in mind, the project design proposes to expand the PA network to the extent possible in a pragmatic way. However, this approach needs a strong compliment of engaging with economic production sectors on mainstreaming biodiversity into sectoral practices. The conventional approach to resource governance in HRML does not factor-in this aspect which is a critical lacuna.

It is in this context that a third option – 'the landscape approach' was considered and found most appropriate, feasible and cost effective. This approach will focus on a cogent and integrated planning framework for natural resource governance departing from the current sector based planning so that baseline policies and practices of economic production sectors related to resource use are influenced and aligned in tune with the ecological imperatives of HRML. This will demonstrate the possibilities for integrating biodiversity conservation into land use planning and decision making in production sectors located in HRML. *Inter alia*, these include adopting a landscape-level, biodiversity-friendly mainstreaming approach that will cover PAs, HVBAs, tea, cardamom, tourism, commercial forestry, subsistence and other livelihood activities, as well as a more detailed sector-by-sector biodiversity-friendly planning approach for each of these sectors. Improved management effectiveness of the PA system (including expansion of PA system) will be embedded within the Landscape Plan in a manner that conservation, livelihoods, and production sectors are engaged on an equal footing and are co-partners of the process. Further, by adopting a demonstration approach, the project design promotes rational use of project resources and gives emphasis on influencing baseline investments in the landscape. Special care has been taken to identify the gaps in the baseline investments and project will try to support these deficient areas to further the project objectives. Besides, it is presumed that the project results will act as replicable reference points for adopting similar approaches in other parts of the country.

This third option is considered to be the most cost-effective deployment of GEF resources because it will ensure that investments in the conservation sector are not compromised by threats emanating outside. Furthermore, the cross-sectoral approach is considered more likely to succeed in bringing competing interests to the table and beginning the dialogue necessary to conserve the biodiversity values of HRML. In line with the precautionary principle, this option will avoid further degradation of ecosystem values and services, which once lost could be prohibitively costly to restore. Finally, in developing the project, lessons learned from similar initiatives (as noted earlier in the document) have been considered and incorporated into project design to ensure that GEF resources are efficiently deployed.

Since 1992, GEF has supported similar catalytic investments in India to improve its cost-effectiveness in generating global environmental benefits (GEB). This project will expand India's previous grant portfolio, leading to improved cost-effectiveness. This project will build upon cost-effective implementation and management practices and baselines already set in the country. The project will seek new efficiencies in the conservation sector's proven capacity to deliver positive environmental results in a cost-effective manner. This will be done in terms of grant review, disbursement and evaluation/monitoring.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities which will be based on the GEF M & E Policy (2010) and UNDP M & E User Guide. The M& E budget is provided in the table below.

Project start: A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first three months of project start-up involving those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office, and, where appropriate/ feasible, regional technical policy and programme advisors, as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year's AWP. The Inception Workshop report will be a key reference document and will be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting. The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues including:

- Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis-à-vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of

Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.

- Based on the project results framework and the GEF SO-2 Tracking Tool, finalize the first AWP. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and re-check assumptions and risks.
- Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- Plan and schedule Project Steering Committee meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organization structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first PSC meeting should be held within the first six months following the Inception Workshop.

Quarterly monitoring: Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform:

- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS.
- Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions will be a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annual monitoring: Annual Project Review/ Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report will be prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements. The PIR will be shared with the GEF OFP also on an annual basis. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual)
- Lessons learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. SO-2 Tracking Tool)

Periodic monitoring through site visits: UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/ Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Steering Committee may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/ BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Steering Committee members.

Mid-term of project cycle: The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The MTE will also be an opportune time to review and fine tune indicators based on the sector plans and micro plans that would have by then been developed and under implementation. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The GEF SO-2 Tracking Tool will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of project: An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Steering Committee meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/ goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to UNDP-GEF's Project Information Management System (PIMS) and to the UNDP

Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The GEF SO-2 Tracking Tool will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Learning and knowledge sharing: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/ or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Table 1. Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US$	Time frame
Inception Workshop (IW)	National Nodal Officer, State Nodal Officer, Project team, UNDP, UNDP GEF	7,000	Within first three months of project start up
Inception Report	Project Team PSC, UNDP CO	None	Immediately following IW
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators	Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. Cost to be covered by targeted survey funds.	Start, mid and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	Oversight by Project GEF Technical Advisor and Programme Officer, UNDP Measurements by regional field officers and local IAs	TBD as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. Cost to be covered by field survey budget.	Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
PIR	Project Team PSC UNDP-GEF	None	Annually
Project Steering Committee meetings	National Nodal Officer and State Nodal Officer	None	Following IW and annually thereafter.
Technical and periodic status reports	Project team Hired consultants as needed	6,000	TBD by Project team and UNDP-CO
Mid-term External Evaluation	Project team PSC UNDP-GEF RCU External Consultants (evaluation team)	24,200	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final External Evaluation	Project team, PSC, UNDP-GEF RCU External Consultants (evaluation team)	32,200	At the end of project implementation
Terminal Report	Project team PSC	None	At least one month before the end of the project
Audit	External Consultant UNDP-CO Project team	10,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites (UNDP staff travel costs to be charged to IA fees)	UNDP-CO, UNDP-GEF RCU Government representatives	None	Yearly average one visit per year
TOTAL indicative COST **Excluding project and UNDP staff time costs**		**79,400**	

Legal Context: This document together with the CPAP signed by the Government and UNDP which is incorporated by reference constitute together a Project Document as referred to in the SBAA and all CPAP provisions apply to this

document. Consistent with the Article III of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement, the responsibility for the safety and security of the implementing partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in the implementing partner's custody, rests with the implementing partner. The implementing partner shall:

> • put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
> • assume all risks and liabilities related to the implementing partner's security, and the full implementation of the security plan.
> • UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of this agreement.

The implementing partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1267/1267ListEng.htm. This provision will be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document.

Communications and Visibility Requirements
Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the UNDP logo. These can be accessed at http://web.undp.org/comtoolkit/reaching-the-outside-world/outside-world-core-concepts-visual.shtml. Full compliance is also required with the GEF Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the GEF logo. These can be accessed at http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP and GEF logos should be the same size. When both logs appear on a publication, the UNDP logo should be on the left top corner and the GEF logo on the right top corner. Further details are available from the UNDP-GEF team based in the region. Full compliance is also required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines").6 Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items. Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

Audit Clause: The project will be subject to standard DEX audit procedure as per UNDP financial regulations, rules and audit policies.

---

[6] The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. **RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):):**
(Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this form. For SGP, use this OFP endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Hem Pande	Joint Secretary / GEF Operation Focal Point	Ministry of Environment and Forests	11/29/2011
Shashi Shekhar	Joint Secretary / New GEF Operational Focal Point	Ministry of Environment and Forests	08/21/1013

B. **GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

> This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu UNDP/GEF Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		October 31, 2013	Doley Tshering Regional Technical Advisor, EBD	+66-2-304-9100 Est. 2600	doley.tshering@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the CPAP for India (2008-2012): Outcome 4.3 Progress towards meeting national commitments under multilateral environmental agreements; and Output 4.3.2 National efforts supported towards conservation and management of natural resources					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: Output 4.3.2 Indicator: Number of new joint initiatives undertaken for integrated biodiversity conservation					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area: 1. Mainstreaming environment and energy					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: Strategic Objective 2 – To mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/ seascapes and sectors; Strategic Priority 4 – Strengthening the policy and regulatory frameworks for mainstreaming biodiversity					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:					
Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets[7]	Means of verification	Risks and Assumptions
The long-term goal to which the project will contribute is the sustainable management of the globally significant mountain biodiversity of India by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation considerations into production sectors, while also taking into account development imperatives, need for sustaining livelihoods and also addressing retrogressive factors including the anticipated impacts of climate change.					
Immediate Objective: To protect biodiversity of the High Range Mountain Landscape of the southern Western Ghats in peninsular India from existing and emergent threats through building an effective collaborative governance framework for multiple use management.	Extent brought under multiple use management planning framework	0 ha	300,000 ha	Mid-term and Final Technical Evaluation	Limited support from production sector due to apprehension that their economic interests would be jeopardized due to participation in the planned conservation interventions

The population dynamics of flora and fauna may depend on various extraneous factors over which project may have little control. |
	Population status of following critical species remain stable or increases: Nilgiri tahr Grizzled giant squirrel Tiger	944 195 34	Remain stable or increases by project end	Monitoring reports, Population estimation reports, Publications of National Tiger Conservation Authority	
	Percentage increase in habitats categorized as high conservation value over the baseline.[8]	PA: 207.5 km^2 Non-PAs: 846 km^2	10% increase by mid-term and 20 % by project end. 10 % increase by mid-term and 15% by project end	Mid-term and Final Technical Evaluation	
	Improvements in water quality in the water bodies of the landscape	BOD -1.5 mg/l at Neriamangalam and 1.4 mg/l at Bhoothathankett	10% improvement by project end.	Monitoring reports, Administrative reports of Pollution Control Board, Kerala State Council for Science and Environment	

---

[7] The time frame for realizing project targets is project end (2018), unless otherwise specified.
[8] Baseline values of conservation zones are given in Table 14 of the Project Document.

Outcome 1: Effective governance framework for multiple-use mountain landscape management in place	Landscape Level Land use Plan (LLLUP) developed adhering to multiple use management decisions	0	1	Approved Plan document	Policy amendments and regulations for addressing biodiversity conservation in sector practices may not receive government and political support
	Sector-specific biodiversity-plans compatible with LLLUP developed leading to effective integration of biodiversity considerations into production practices	0	At least six Sector Plans (Forestry, Tourism, Tea, Cardamom, Agriculture and Tribal Development) and Biodiversity Conservation Plans (5) in place	Approved Sector Plan documents Approved Biodiversity Conservation Plans	Stakeholders may perceive the project as restrictive rather than enabling due to its focus on biodiversity and a cautious approach towards normal development
	Effective and functioning cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder institution (including conservation, livelihood and production) established.	0	1	Government Orders or notifications, meeting records	Non PA forest Divisions will have work on conservation plans outside the regular Working Plan system, for which a process is laid down. However this aspect is latent or non- existent.
	Number of key policy and management framework/ decisions adopted at local and state level related to sustainable mountain landscape management	0	7 (Wildlife Protection Act, Forest Conservation Act, Environment Protection Act, Forest Rights Act, Cardamom Rules, KDH Act, Land Assignment Act, Commodities Act), National Working Plan Code and other Management decisions	Policy briefs Relevant GOs & notifications	Local policies, processes and management decisions related to forest and production sectors may not lead to land/ resource-use change in favour of biodiversity conservation

	Improvement in Systemic Level Indicators of **Capacity Development Scorecard** (Annex 19)	SYSTEMIC LEVEL	B/L	Tgt.	Mid-term and Final Evaluation	

SYSTEMIC LEVEL	B/L	Tgt.
1. Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, legislations, strategies, programme	40%	80%
2. Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies and programmes	33%	80%
3. Capacity to engage and build consensus among all stakeholders	15%	80%
4. Capacity to mobilize information and knowledge	35%	80%
5. Capacity to monitor, evaluate and report and learn at the sector and project levels.	30%	80%

Outcome 2: Multiple use mountain landscape management is applied securing the ecological integrity of HRML	Improved management effectiveness PAs as measured and recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)	168 out of 300	Increase in METT scores by 10 percent by year 3 By 20 percent by year 5	METT scorecard prepared annually. Independent mid-term and final evaluations	The benefits generated by the project may be offset by the impacts of climate change

Resources of the project are insufficient for meeting the objectives over the large area of landscape |
| | Increase in area under PA system | 37,100 ha | Increase by 11,500 ha | Project Reports; Independent mid-term and final evaluations | |
| | Areas of forest fragments/ HVBAs in tea gardens inventoried and secured | 0 | 4,000 ha | Project Reports; Independent mid-term and final evaluations | |

	% reduction in fuel wood consumption for processing in tea and cardamom using energy efficient technology and improved design (indicator, baselines and targets will have to be re-visited once the Sector Plans are prepared by mid-term)	Baseline to be measured in 1st 3 months of project	10% decline over baseline usage and 20% in cardamom	Survey reports, Administrative reports, Mid-term and Final Evaluation	
	Number of new demonstration programmes/ featuring biodiversity friendly production practices (e.g. curing units/ energy efficiency options/ farming practices) adopted	0	20	Administrative reports, Mid-term and Final Evaluation	
Outcome 3: Strengthened community capacities for community based sustainable use and management of wild resources	Number of development plans of PRIs/ CBOs that incorporate bio-diversity friendly practices	0	100	Number of Plan documents, Administrative records	Local communities may not be willing to participate in the project unless the project addresses their livelihood needs
	Number of community representatives/ PRIs trained in biodiversity mainstreaming activities	0	500	Administrative records, Mid-term and Final Evaluation	
	Number of new micro-enterprises at individual/SHG/ CBO/ and other local institution levels based sustainable resource use leading to proportionate increase in income for participating communities Proportion of the new micro-enterprises supported that are managed by women headed households or women's groups and institutions	0 / baseline income to be assessed in year 1 0	Target to be defined after design of the micro-plans At least 15% increase in income reported At least 50 %	Administrative reports and records	The history of the landscape is replete with efforts of farmers and settlers to establish rights over land and the idea of a landscape level plan may appear to be pitted against their tenurial interests.
	% reduction in biomass consumption in lemon grass enterprises through adoption of improved technology.	494,361 kg/ year	10 percent reduction by 3rd year and 20 percent by project end.	Administrative records, Mid-term and Final Evaluation	

	Appropriate model agreement between different agencies on the effective implementation of FRA as evidence through sustainable use and protection of biodiversity in Edamalakudy Panchayat	0	1	Agreement document, Mid-term and Final Evaluation	

Project Outputs	
Output 1.1	Strengthened knowledge generation and dissemination system improves decision making related to sustainable land and resource use
Output 1.2	Landscape level land- use plan prepared and sustainable resource management systems in place
Output 1.3	Biodiversity considerations are mainstreamed into sector plans and practices
Output 1.4	A dedicated cross sectoral landscape level institutional platform ensures sectoral compliance with management prescriptions of Landscape and Sector Plans
Output 1.5	Replication strategy developed for multiple use management of mountain landscapes
Output 1.6	Policies and legal framework reviewed and harmonized for ensuring sustainable management of mountain landscapes
Output 2.1	Capacities developed among conservation and production sector staff for applying landscape approaches to biodiversity conservation into sectoral operations
Output 2.2	Management effectiveness of PA system strengthened to address existing and emerging threats to PA systems
Output 2.3	HVBAs secured through improved conservation focus and interventions
Output 2.4	Biodiversity mainstreaming demonstrated in key production sectors
Output 3.1	Community based organizations (Panchayats, JFMCs, Self Help Groups (SHGs)) have adequate capacities to plan sustainable resource use
Output 3.2	Support to sustainable resource use practices accentuate positive resource dependency
Output 3.3	Community-based natural resource management governance model for the unique tribal local self-government (Edamalakudy Panchayat)

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

I. **Response to comments from GEF Secretariat at the time of PIF approval**

Review Questions	Secretariat comment at PIF (PFD)/ Work Programme inclusion	Response
16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	Yes, clear description is provided at this stage. Further detail analysis is expected during further project preparation.	Detailed socio-economic benefits including gender dimensions to be delivered by the project have been worked out in detail during the PPG phase (please see Section B.2 of the CEO endorsement document). The socio-economic benefits will span across all sections of society including women and marginalized groups. The project's underlying principle embraces cultural diversity and gender equity because land use planning and natural resource management is very much cross-cutting and a multi-sectoral issue. The project recognizes that sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity conservation envirgaed through the implementation of the land use planning framework needs strong participation of all members of the community –women, men and other disadvantaged groups. Given the strong roles women play in natural resource and land use decisions and management, the project will ensure equitable participation of women, and men in project activities. The project will support gender sensitive and biodiversity compatible land uses and practices based on thorough analysis of local land use systems, traditional practices and the roles played by men and women at the local level. Women's participation in decision-making and implementation has been recognized in designing the project and special attention will be given for training activities and their decision-making roles. The project envisages that socio-economic benefits including positive gender impacts will secure the livelihoods of the local communities, improve their capacity to plan and implement community-based natural resource management plans and engender an enhanced sense of custodian of biodiversity in the area. The details of the project interventions that will deliver these benefits are described in the project document part II "strategy". It may be noted that the outcome 3 "Strengthened capacities for community based sustainable use and management of wild resources" is designed to meet this objective, -- reduce pressures on biodiversity originating from resource use by local communities while improving lives and livelihoods of local communities. Please also see section A5 "incremental cost reasoning" for a description of how these local benefits will translate to global benefits.
18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes, adequate risks are addressed at this stage. Further detail analysis and information are expected by the time of CEO endorsement	Detailed risks and assumptions, risk ratings and mitigation strategy have been further assessed and elaborated during the PPG phase in consultation with stakeholders. See Section A.6 of the CEO Endorsement document provides details. An additional risk that the PPG team has identified is that of the impacts of climate variability as an important threat. In this regard, the project team has made climate proofing, an important element in the project design. To start with, the project proposes to address this risk by building a better understanding on the impacts of climate change on HRML (Output 1.1). The findings of this study will give inputs into the process of landscape-level planning – key focus being on maintaining connectivity across the landscape, and maintaining functional diversity (both key to enhancing the resilience of ecosystems to climate change induced fire, drought and other perturbations). By reducing existing anthropogenic stressors to ecosystems, the project will enhance the capacity of ecosystems to recover from such climate change triggered perturbation.
19. Is the project consistent	Linkages with several relevant GEF and	This has been addressed in the Section A.7 of the CEO Endorsement document. The project will

	and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	UNDP funded projects are noted. The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF), a partnership program among the GEF and other donors, has also provided significant investment in the Western Ghats hotspot through various international and national NGOs and other CSOs. In addition, the Global Tiger Initiative initiated by the WB and GEF is also planning activities in India. Please also clarify linkages, lessons learned, and coordination with these key conservation initiatives.	coordinate with the Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF) that is investing in community and CSO conservation actions to preserve and protect globally threatened species and habitats in the Western Ghats. Efforts will be made to ensure synergies, sharing of lessons and cross-fertilization of ideas between the two. Similarly, through inviting participation in the Project Steering Committee at the national level, synergy and coordination with the Global Tiger Initiative (GTI) of the World Bank and GEF will also be guaranteed. In addition, the project will coordinate actions with other government and non-government initiatives where similarities in the strategy of the proposed project open up an opportunity for cross fertilizing good practices. To facilitate coordination, the managers of each of the three landscape projects (implemented by UNDP) will be tasked with working together to complete a detailed coordination plan. Ideally, the plan will be formulated during project inception, but no later than the first year of project activity. This joint coordination plan will identify coordination opportunities and specify coordination actions to be taken during project implementation. This will include both formal (e.g., yearly coordination meetings, joint training programs) and informal mechanisms (e.g., expertise sharing, distribution of lessons learned and materials generated) for information exchange.
20. Is the project implementation/execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, adequate information is provided at this stage. Further details on the institutional arrangement and coordination are expected at the time of CEO endorsement.	Details of implementation arrangements provided under the sub-heading of a) Project Oversight and Management, b) Budgeted M&E Plan, and c) Legal context of the CEO Endorsement Document.	

II. Response to STAP Comments

Comments	Response
…. while adequately dealing with forest conservation and crop issues, the PIF does not however propose either monitoring or specific actions to follow up the mention of the critical role of mountain ecosystems regarding water supply and quality or to follow up regarding assurance of adequate environmental flows to maintain the stated freshwater biodiversity. STAP requests the proponents to include a water and soils sub-component which tracks baseline flow and quality at suitable locations downstream of project intervention areas and control sites, in order to track the water retention and run-off related change in PA functions, and at sites where pesticide-related runoff in and near production areas may be monitored. The advantage of such a sub-component will be to demonstrate impact of the land use and cover reforms that are the target of the project, and to highlight the catchment management aspects of the framework. STAP also advises the proponents to extend the Project Framework mention in Component 1 of valuation of ecosystem goods and services from HRML to specifically include water-related issues, and consideration of the potential for	Ensuring hydrological functionality is indeed central to ecosystem integrity of the mountain ecosystems. The project team has placed special emphasis in the project design to interventions focused on maintaining and restoring the quality of ecosystems so that they retain the ability to provision hydrological functions. To full-proof this aspect, the project design goes beyond the Protected Area centric approach and focuses on mainstreaming environmental management in economic production sector operations. It may be noted that one of the key aims of the project is to rationalize/ reduce the pesticide use in tea and cardamom sectors and the resultant pollution load in the river systems in the project landscape. In fact, the Project design has identified the water quality as one of the Project Objective level indicators. More indicative activities to be carried out under the project that will support this aspect are given at Annexure 16. Similarly, under Output 1.1, a few studies have been suggested related to this such as: a) stream ecology and restoration plans; b) fish community structure in relation physical and chemical settings of the waterscape in different stream orders; c) water recharge and utilization in plantations; and d) valuation of ecosystem services of HRML. These studies are expected to provide the requisite baseline information for factoring in aspects such as payment of ecosystem services (PES) etc during the implementation of the project. Further, the project design has also included water and soil conservation as integral to land-use planning and land management especially as part of eco-

payments for ecosystem services. Additionally, consideration should be given to including water authorities within the key stakeholders listing, which is shown in section B5. Finally, in the full project brief, the proponents are encouraged to set out clear indicators for impact at the process and environmental impact levels, based on the deliverables outlined in the project Framework and Table B2 within the PIF.	restoration. In addition, one of the main stakeholders of the project and a member of the proposed cross-sectoral platform is the agency dealing with water resources.

III.   Response to comments from Council Member Countries at the time of PIF approval

Comments	Response
☐ *Canada Comments* - The project‟s financial contributions from the private sector is a very positive elements, although $1 million does seem slightly low given the focus placed in the project to working with tea, cardamom and tourism sectors on sustainable use of biodiversity. Is it worthwhile to transform a protected area-centric planning process that does not work, into a landscape-based planning process? What guarantees that moving from PA to landscape will enable success? What are the underlying reasons that the PA-centric planning process does not currently work? Will these be addressed? While it is recognized that a landscape planning approach will bring more diverse actors to the table and allow for sustainable use discussions, will this alone enable success? - While it is understood that the project does not focus only on PAs, it does intend on strengthening the PAs in this region of India. However, there is little discussion in the PIF in regards to the financial sustainability of the PAs. Furthermore, the project proposes a relatively innovative approach to conservation planning. Will the project invest in any evidence-based learning around this innovation, helping to determine whether or not it is something that should / could be replicated? All of the biodiversity projects being proposed should provide information on how they relate to the country‟s obligations to the CBD, particularly the Aichi Targets. As presented, the PIFs is not clear on how it will help the country meet the Aichi targets. The project proponents should provide this information in the final project proposals.	We thank the council member for this comment. The project is a first in terms of targeted involvement of the private sector in partnership with government and other sectors in biodiversity conservation and natural resource management in the particular in the State and also count among the few in the country. The project recognizes that success of any biodiversity conservation efforts in the area depends on the participation and support of the private sector because they have direct control over large areas in the landscape while their land use decisions also impact a much larger area outside their operations. It is in this regard that the project envisages influencing the land-use decisions of the private sector (economic production sectors like tea, cardamom and tourism), so that their policies and practices are in tune with biodiversity conservation objectives. It aims to achieve this through providing largely support for building 'soft' skills – providing the sectors the necessary know-how to review, design and implement biodiversity compatible practices. Further, given the limited resources of the project, the project design has adopted a "demonstration approach" whereby few pilot areas, interventions will be selected to demonstrate the biodiversity mainstreaming measures, that will then be replicated by the indivdiaul sectors, and also integrated into the overall landscape level land use plan (please see full description in the Project Strategy section of the Project Document). This approach, we believe will make the most efficient use of the limited resources. Given the complex mix of challenges, the trajectory of development in the area, and the paramount need to engage all the stakeholders to conserve biodiversity and maintain ecological integrity in the high ranges mountain areas, the project team feels that the only possible solution is the move towards an inclusive land use planning and management approach that moves planning away from the currently ineffective PA centric approach. The project document, particularly section I B explains in greater detail the rationale for, the assumptions made and also the limitations of the current PA centric planning approach. The project design also emphasizes following an adaptive management strategy that makes use of evidence based planning around innovative initiatives from both within and outside the landscape to slowly transform the development direction and practices in the landscape. The project design integrates sustainability elements including PA financing (please see description in Section II G of the project document). However, work on the comprehensive PA financial sustainability is beyond the scope of the current project. As suggested, the project document has incorporated relevant provisions of CBD including conformity to 'Aichi targets i.e., *Strategic goal C- To improve the status of biodiversity by*

	safeguarding ecosystem, species and genetic diversity. Target 11- Trends in the connectivity of PAs and other area based approaches integrated into landscapes and seascapes (See section II A – Project conformity)
Denmark Comments: A basic question could be: Is it appropriate to allocate 37 mill USD in order to protect an area of approximately 27.000 hectares (1.370 USD/ha) of protected land? Even though the Kerala State Government seems to be prepared to deliver 28 mill USD as co-financing, it seems difficult to understand that a "pilot" based on that kind of investment/ha could have broadly relevance and as such be generally implemented for widespread impact. ☐ It is not easy to find coherence between description of activities and the (rather large sums) allocated for these in the budget. (Like why it will cost more than 30 mill. USD to apply "Multiple Use Mountain Landscape Management" (MUML) and "Community Based Sustainable Management of Wild Resources" in a rather discreet area and assumingly with sufficient respect to sustainability challenges?)	We thank the council member for the comment and would like to provide the following clarification. The project covers a large landscape (more than 310,000 ha) encompassing a mosaic of land uses that includes conservation (PA management), forestry, agriculture and various other production sectors such as tea estates, cardamom plantations and also community homesteads and lands. The project will aim to put in place a cross-sectoral land use management framework, and compliance monitoring and enforcement system that will cover the entire landscape. It will ensure that development in production sectors such as tea, cardamom and tourism is congruent with biodiversity conservation needs while also working on improving the management effectiveness of the protected areas. Thus, while the PA area account for only around 37,100 ha of the total area in the landscape, the various project interventions will cover a much larger area. This is important because a significant proportion of biodiversity in the area is actually located outside the protected areas. As such PAs alone will not be sufficient or adequate to secure globally significant biodiversity. In addition, unchecked developments outside the PAs and existing practices of production sectors if not addressed are placing considerable pressures on the protected areas. In this view, it may be noted that the total project resources of $37 million will be invested over an area of more than 310,000 ha. PA specific activities will only account for a total of $ 7.87 million or around 20 percent of the overall budget of the project. The project document provides far more detail on the various activities under each of the components than was possible in the PIF write-up. The project team has noted the concerns expressed by the council member and have addressed the issue of coherence between description of activities and the budget allocated for respective activities (please see Prodoc Section IIB "Project goal, objectives, outcomes and outputs" and also section IV "total budget and work plan".
INTERSESSIONAL WORK PROGRAM: COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS (Reference GEF GEF/IS/25 13 ☐ It is not clear from the documentation how the "Land Scape Level Land-Use Plan (LLLUP)" allocating land "to optimal land-use" based on biodiversity considerations is meant to guide future land-use in reality. What kind of local governing structures will actually take/be responsibility/responsible for actual implementation of the LLLUP? How is the LLLUP meant to fit in with existing plans? Which implications will the LLLUP have on existing land ownership and how is the project going to tackle conflict of interest? ☐ Not easy to see how local partners have been involved and what kind of actual role they will play	The preparation of LLLUP is an integral component of the project. The preparation of LLLUP is envisaged to be a highly multi-disciplinary activity. To give the highest ownership to LLLUP, it is proposed to place the LLLUP before the cross-sectoral platform that will be put in place by the project – HRSDS. It is envisioned that LLLUP shall become a guidance document for all land use decisions in the landscape. Necessary capacity building and compliance mechanisms are proposed in the project document for the effective implementation of LLLUP. Representatives of key stakeholders shall be actively involved right through the project – planning, execution and compliance monitoring. Their role will be

☐ There seems to be an imbalance between expenditure and presumed impacts and the poverty reduction aspect does not have a prominent role at all. (i.e. no indication of the number of people who eventually could benefit from the project)	crystallized through the LLLUP, Sector Plans and functioning of the cross-sectoral platform called HRSDS. Functions and capacities of key stakeholders are given at Annexure 14 of the project document. The main beneficiaries of the project (direct/ indirect) are tribals (around 34,000), woman (around 350,000) and other disadvantaged sections of the society.
Germany Comments Germany approves the project proposal, but would like to provide the following suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal: We recommend that the assessment and valuation of key ecosystem services (incl. provision of clean water) from the High Range Mountain Landscape should be emphasized more strongly under Component 1 as a basis for the formulation of a *Landscape level Land Use Plan*, for improving governance of the multiple use landscape, and identification of instruments incentivizing sustainable ecosystem management (e.g. through payment for ecosystem services).	We agree with the suggestion. This has been made explicit in the FSP. The project's output 1.1 list a key activity as the evaluation of ecosystem services from HRML that will guide the formulation of the Landscape Level Land Use Plan.

A.   DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT
     IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

   None

B.   PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	*GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)*		
	Budgeted Amount	*Amount Spent To date*	*Amount Committed*
Activity 1 – Landscape / site profiling and strategic environment assessment	40,000	23,000	17,000
Activity 2 – Capacity assessment at systemic and institutional levels	20,000	11,500	8,500
Activity 3 – Assessment of alternative livelihoods and community capacities	20,000	11,000	9,000
Activity 4 – Feasibility analysis and budget	8,600	4029.89	4570.11
Total	**88,600.00**	**49,529.89**	**39,070.11**

Notes:
+ To be paid for work performed/completed (payments to be made no later than 31 September 2013)

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**:**
N/A

---

[9]   If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up
     to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the
     completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.